THE LIGHT OF TRUTH

— OR —

SIDDHANTA DEEPIKA.

A Monthly Journal, Devoted to Religion, Philosophy, Literature, Science, &c.,

***Commenced on the Queen's Commemoration Day,* 1897.**

VOL. III. } **MADRAS, MAY 1900.** } **No. 12.**

TRANSLATIONS.

THE VEDA'NTA-SU'TRAS WITH S'RI'KANTHA BHA'SHYA.

(*Continued from page 200*).

Adhikarana 9.

The Sûtrakâra now proceeds to shew that, being thus the Lord of all and the all-penetrating Entity, the Parames'vara Himself is the dispenser of the fruits of all actions, either Himself directly or in the form of the respective Gods concerned:

Hence is the fruit, because of the propriety. (III. ii. 37.)

Here a doubt arises as to whether the dispenser of the fruits of all actions to those who perform them is the Parabrahman Himself who has been declared in the preceding adhikarana to be the Lord of all, or some one else.

(*Pûrvapaksha*) :—Karma (action), though vanishing away the moment it is produced, has yet the power of yielding the fruit at some future time through the medium of the apûrva (the unseen form which action is said to assume prior to the realisation of its fruit). Thus action itself being capable of yielding its fruit, it seems unnecessary to postulate a distinct unknown entity in the form of the Parames'vara. Therefore, the Parames'vara cannot be the dispenser of the fruits of actions.

(*Siddhânta*) :—It is from the Parames'vara duly worshipped that all obtain the fruits of their actions; for, it is reasonable. It stands to reason that devotees should obtain the fruits of their actions from the Parames'vara who is worshipped, as from a king to whom service is rendered. Certainly, neither the insentient action itself nor the insentient apûrva (its invisible form) has the power to discriminate and dispense the fruits of several actions just in accordance with their respective nature; for, we do not find any such power possessed by service which is insentient. Here, Parames'vara, as known through the scriptures, is not a mere postulate, and there is therefore no fault of a needless assumption. It is in fact said :—

> "For He makes him, whom He wishes to lead up from these worlds, do good deeds; He makes him, whom he wishes to lead down from these worlds, do a bad deed."*

* Kaush. Up. 3-8.

In these words the S'ruti declares that I's'vara alone dispenses the fruits of the acts of Dharma and Adharma and impels people to them. On the other hand, it is the postulating of the apûrva not taught in the scriptures that involves the fault of needless assumption. Hence the conclusion that Parames'vara Himself worshipped by works dispenses the fruits of actions; not the actions themselves.

And because so He is declared to be. (III. ii. 38.)

Indeed the Parames'vara is declared to be the lord of all works,—as worshipped by their means and as the dispenser of their fruits,—in the following passages:

"...Rudra, the Lord of hymns, the Lord of sacrifices, possessed of medicaments that confer delight.*

"Secure Rudra, the king of sacrifice..."†

The Smriti, too, based on these passages of the S'ruti, declares that the Parames'vara is the lord of all sacrifices:

"Let everyone worship, by soma, the Divine Being who is associated with Umâ and who is adorned with the moon."

And the Râmâyana, too, says:

"There is no sacrifice, higher than the horse-sacrifice (as'vamedha), in the matter of Rudra's worship."

And in the Chamakas also (Taittirîya-Samhitâ IV. vii. 1—11)—which read "May food (come) to me), may permission (come) to me;......may Dhâtri (come) to me, ...may Vishnu (come) to me"—all things such as food, and all Gods such as Vishnu are declared as things to be given, so that,—as the sole alternative left,—the Parames'vara alone is the dispenser of the fruits of all actions. Therefore it is the Parames'vara alone who is to be worshipped by all sacrifices, and who is the dispenser of all fruits.

For the same reasons, Jaimini holds that it is Dharma. (III. ii. 39).

Jaimini thinks that Dharma itself is the dispenser of the fruits for the same reasons, *i. e.*, because it stands to reason and because it is so declared in the s'ruti. It stands to reason, because in the case of tilling, crushing, and so on, we see that the result is produced either directly or indirectly by the action itself. That the act itself in the form of apûrva yields its fruits may be taken as declared in the s'ruti, inasmuch as we cannot otherwise account for the injunction of an act as the means by which he who seeks a particular result can attain it.

But Badarayana (thinks it is) the former, because He is mentioned as the cause. (III. ii. 40.)

The blessed Badarayana thinks that the Parames'vara Himself mentioned before is the dispenser of the fruits of actions, inasmuch as in the very injunctions of works,—such as "he who seeks prosperity should sacrifice a white animal in honour of Vâyu; Vâyu indeed is the swiftest God...and he alone leads the sacrificer to prosperity,"*—Vâyu and other Gods, ensouled as they are by the Parames'vara, are mentioned as the sources of the fruits. It is only in the absence of a God that we will have to postulate that the transitory act assumes the form of Apûrva. On the other hand, when in the sequel of the section enjoining the act the s'ruti itself explains—with a view to satisfy the natural curiosity that arises close upon the injunction—who it is that dispenses the fruit, that explanation alone must be accepted, just as from the passage "they are very well established, they who perform these rites"† the fruit of the act enjoined—without which the injunction is not complete—is accepted as declared in the sequel. From the Atharvasiras, which reads "He who is called Rudra is the Lord," we understand that the I's'vara is in the form of all Gods such as Vâyu. In the same upanishad, in the words "He who knows me knows all Gods" it is declared that by knowing Him one gets a knowledge of all Gods who are all ensouled by Himself. Hence the conclusion that it is the Parames'vara,—the Supreme Brahman, Siva, Umâ's Lord Himself—who is in the form of all Gods, who has to be worshipped by all acts, and who is the dispenser of all fruits.

THIRD PA'DA.

Adhikarana—I.

In the preceding portion of the work has been determined the nature of the Pas'u, the worshipper (upâsaka), spoken of as 'thou' (in "Thou art That"), and endued with the attribute of eternality etc.; as also of S'iva, the Lord (Pati), the object of all worship, spoken of as 'That', and endued with omnis-

* Rig Veda 1-43-4.
Ibid. 4-3-1.

* Tait. Sam. 2-1-1.
† Tândya. Br. 23-2-4.

cience and other attributes. Now a question arising as to how to worship Him, the answer comes in the sequel:

What is enjoined in all Veda'ntas (is the same) because of the absence of all difference in the command etc. (III. iii. 1).

In all the Vedântas (upanishads) the Dahara-upâsana and the like are treated. A doubt arises as to whether the upâsana treated in different upanishads is one and the same or differs with the different recensions.

(*Pûrvapaksha*): As context (prakarana) differs with difference in recension (S'âkhâ), the upâsana differs with different s'akhâs. Now, in the Chhândogya and the Taittiríyaka, the Dahara-upâsana is treated. In the one, such attributes as sinlessness are described in the passage which begins with the words, "The A'tman who is free from sin, free from old age, free from death,"* etc. In the other, in the passage "The right, the true,"† etc., such attributes as dark-brown-ness are mentioned. Here, owing to the difference in the attributes, the upâsana differs. In the Chhândogya, again, the Panchâgni-Vidyâ (the contemplation of Five Fires) is designated as Kauthuma, while it is designated as Vâjasaneya in the Brihadâranyaka. Here, owing to the difference in the designation, the upâsana differs. In the Mundaka-s'âkhâ is spoken of a rite called S'irovrata (the ceremony of carrying fire on the head) in the words,

> "Let a man tell this Brahma-vidyâ (science of Brahman) to those only by whom the siro-vrata has been performed according to the rule."‡

S'irovrata is a special ceremony connected with the study of the Vedas and it is enjoined on the Atharvanikas (the students of the Atharva-Veda), not on others Owing to this difference in the rite, the upâsana differs. Thus, the upâsana differs owing to the difference in the s'âkhâ etc.

(*Siddhânta*) :—The Dahara-upâsana and the like, taught in all the different upanishads, are one and the same; for, as in the case of injunctions of sacrificial works, so here, the words of injunction (chodanâ), the results to be attained, the form of the Devatâ, and the designations (of the upâsanas) are all same. In the first place, the terms of injunction—such as "let him know", "let him contemplate"—are same in the different s'akhâs. Even the results to be attained,— such as the attaining of Brahman,—are same. The objects of worship, too, are same, such as the Vais'vânara-Brahman. And even the designations are same, such as the Vais'vânara-Vidyâ and so on. Therefore the Upâsana is one and the same. Notwithstanding the use of different verbs—such as 'let him *know*', 'let him *contemplate*',—the upâsana does not differ. In the Chhândogya, the Dahara-Vidyâ is enjoined in the words, "What exists within that small ether, that should be *sought* for;"* and the Taittirîya enjoins it in the words "What is there within, that should be *contemplated*."† In this case, since the seat of contemplation etc., are same, since Brahman, the object of contemplation, is the same, and since the attributes mentioned in the two upanishads are not opposed to one another, the Vidyâ (upâsana) is the same. The Brihadâranyaka and the Chhândogya-Upanishads describe the nature of the five fires to be contemplated,—namely, heaven, rain, earth, man and woman; and the nature of these fires is described in the same way in both. Hence no distinction in the vidyâ (upâsana).

If (you say it is not so) because of the distinction (implied), (we reply that the distinction is possible) even (when the upa'sana is) one. (III. iii. 2).

(*Objection*) :—Repetition of the same thing, combined with difference in the context (prakarana) or sákhâ, points to a difference in the upâsana. Therefore the upâsana taught in different sâkhâs is not one and the same.

(*Answer*) :—Though the upâsana is one and the same, repetition of the same upâsana in a different context (prakarana) or sâkhâ can be accounted for by the fact of the people who learn the vidyâ from that other sâkhâ being different. Therefore, the fact does not point to a distinction in the upâsana.

(The s'iro-vrata) pertains to the recitation of the text, because as such, indeed, it is treated of in the ritualistic section. And as in the case of sava, it is restricted to them. (III. iii. 3).

The s'iro-vrata enjoined in the Atharva-Veda in the words "To them alone let him tell this Brahma-Vidyâ"‡ is intended as an appendage to the recitation of that Veda (svâdhyâya), not as an appendage to the Vidyâ or Upâsana; for, the passage "He shall not study it who has not performed the rite"§

* Op. cit. 8-7-1.
† Mahânâ. 11.
‡ Mund. up. 3-2-10.

* Op. cit 8-1-1.
† Mahânâ. 10-23.
‡ Munda. Up. 3-2-10.
§ Ibid. 3-2-11.

shows that the rite pertains to the recitation of the Vedic text, and in the samâchâra-grantha, *i. e.*, in the work called Samâchâra (ritual,) it is declared to be a Veda-Vrata—a ritual pertaining to the Vedic recitation—in the words "This, too, has been treated by the treatment of the Veda-Vrata." In the phrase 'Brahma-Vidyâ', the word 'Brahman' means Veda. Therefore just as the Sava-homa is confined to the followers of the Atharva-Veda, so is the s'iro-vrata confined to them alone, so that it does not point to any distinction in the Vidyâ or Upâsana itself.

The (S'ruti) also declares. (III. iii. 4.)

The S'ruti itself shows the unity of upâsana. In the section of the Dahara-Vidyâ, the Mahopanishad and the Kaivalya-Upanishad describe the form of the I's'vara as follows:

"The Right, the True, the Supreme Brahman, in person dark-brown, chaste, divers eyed."*

"Associated with Umâ, the Parames'vara, the Lord, Three-eyed, Nilakantha (dark-necked, tranquil."†

From this one may think that, as a corporeal being, the I's'vara is subject to sin, decay, death and the like. It is to prevent this supposition that the Chhândogya-Upanishad declares that He is possessed of the eight attributes mentioned in the passage beginning with the words "Now, as to the small lotus in the city of Brahman" etc.‡ In these cases repetition can be accounted for by different attributes being spoken of in different sâkhâs. So, there is no room for the supposition that it points to a difference in the Vidyâ itself. Accordingly, since the terms of the injunction are identical, *i. e.* owing to the absence of a difference in the terms of injunction, etc., pointing to a difference in the Upàsana, the Upâsana taught in all the Upanishads is one and the same.

Adhikarana—2.

The sûtrakâra now proceeds to state what is aimed at in shewing the unity of the Upâsanas enjoined in all the Upanishads:

A collection (should be made of attributes) owing to identity of the purpose. As in the case of the appendages of an injunction, so, too, in the case of (an Upasana which is) similar (in kind) (III. iii. 5.)

Here, though oneness of Upásana has been established, a doubt arises as to whether the attributes mentioned in one sàkhâ should be gathered in another s'âkhâ or not.

(*Pûrvapaksha* :)—They should not be gathered. To explain: in the Chhândogya are mentioned in the Dahara-Vidyá the attributes such as sinlessness, but not in the Taittirîya-Upanishad. The attributes mentioned in the Chhândogya-Upanishad should not be gathered in the Taittirîya, because they are not mentioned in the latter. As to the purposes of the Upâsana, thay are served by the attributes mentioned there, namely 'dark-brown' etc. What need is there for the gathering of attributes mentioned elsewhere, for which there is no direction in the sruti?

(*Siddhânta* :)—As against the foregoing we hold as follows: In all cases, where the Upàsana is one, such attributes as sinlessness mentioned in the Chhândogya in connection with the Dahara-Vidyà etc., should be gathered together elsewhere in connection with the Daharavidyà etc., taught in the Taittirîyaka and other Upanishads, inasmuch as the purpose of these attributes is the same, namely, to subserve the upâsana. Just as the subsidiary acts (angas) enjoined (in different s'âkhâs) as parts of one main act enjoined are gathered together in the case of the Agnihotra and the like, so in the case of the Dahara-Upàsana or the like, where the terms of injunction etc., are same, the attributes (mentioned in different s'âkhâs) should be gathered together. Wherefore, it stands to reason that the attributes mentioned in different s'akhâs in connection with the same Upâsanas should be gathered together.

Adhikarana—3.

(If you maintain) that they are different because of the scripture, (we reply) no, because of the non-distinction. (III. iii. 6).

In the Brihadâranyaka-upanishad and in the Chhandogya-upanishad, the contemplation of the Udgitha song as Prâna, leading to the enemy's defeat, is enjoined. A doubt arises as to whether there is, or there is not, a unity of upasana in this case.

(*Purvapaksha*): Since the terms of injunction etc. are same, there is a unity of upasana.

(*Objection*) :—The object of the upasana as Prâna enjoined in the Brihadâranyaka is the agent in the act of singing, *i. e.*, the one that sings the Udgitha, as may be known from the following passage:

* Mahanâ. 12.
† Kaivalyr. Up.
‡ Op. cit. 8-1-1.

"Then they said to the breath in the mouth: 'Do thou sing for us.' 'Yes,' said the breath, and sang."*

But in the case of the Chhandogas the object of contemplation is the Udgîtha itself which is sung, i.e., which is the object of the act of singing, as may be seen from the following passage:

"Then comes this breath (of life) in the mouth. They meditated upon the Udgîtha as that breath."†

Therefore, the upâsanas are different.

(*Answer*:)—The opening statements in both are the same. The Brihadâranyaka opens the section with the following words:

"There were two kinds of descendants of Prajâpati, the Devas and the Asuras. Now the Devas were indeed the younger, the Asuras the elder ones. The Devas who were struggling in these worlds, said 'Well, let us overcome the Asuras at the sacrifices by means of the Udgitha."‡

The Chhândogya opens the section with the following words:—

"When the Devas and Asuras struggled together, both of the race of Prajapati, the Devas took the udgitha thinking they would vanquish the Asuras by it."§

Therefore as the opening statements are same, the upâsanas are identical.

(*Siddhânta*:)—The sûtrakâra states the conclusion as follows:

* Bri: Up. 1-3-7.
† Chha. Up. 1-2-7.
‡ Op. Cit. 1-3-1.
§ Op. Cit. 1-2-1.

Or (they are) not (one) owing to a difference in the context, as (in the contemplations of the udgitha) as greater than the great, etc. (III. iii. 7).

The Vidyâs taught in the two upanishads are not one and the same, because of a distinction in the context (prakarana). Now, the contemplation taught by the chhandogas refers to the Pranava which is a part of the udgîtha as declared in the passage "Let a man meditate upon the syllable Om, (a part of) the Udgîtha."*

But the contemplation taught by the Vâjins refers to the whole udgîtha. Thus owing to a distinction in the way they begin, the forms contemplated upon are different, and the upasanas, therefore, are also different. Just as among the Udgîtha-upasanas taught in one and the same sâkhâ, the contemplation of the udgîtha as 'greater than the great' differs from the contemplation of the same as 'golden,' so, too, here the upasanas differ.

The Sûtrakâra raises an objection and answers:

If (you think they are same) owing to (an identity in) the designation, that (is answered by what) has been said (above). This (identity in designation) is possible indeed. (III. iii. 8).

It should not be contended that the upâsanas taught in the two sâkhâs are same because of the identity in the designation 'Udgîtha Vidyâ.' For, though the things enjoined are different, the identity of designation is possible. For instance, in the case of the daily Agnihotra and the Agnihotra pertaining to the Kundapayin's sacrifice, though the names are same, the rites are different. So here also. Hence no discordance.

A MAHA'DEVA S'A'STRY, B.A.

(*To be continued.*)

* Chha. Up. 1-1-1.

SIVAJÑA'NA SIDDHIYA'R

OF

ARUL NANDI SIVA A'CHA'RYA

SUTRA II—ADVAITA LAKSHANA.

Adhikarana—3.

(*Continued from page* 204.)

All are Tatvas.

21. The whole Universe, constituting all that has form, the formless, and those that have form and no form, is the manifestation of the Tatvas. These Tatvas manifest themselves, each in three ways, Stûla, Sûkshma and Para. The Jîvas that always stand connected with the Tatvas which are under the impelling influence of the Sádákyas, also bear their names. Thus all things are, in fact, Tatvas only.

NOTE.—'எல்லாம்' in the original, gives us 'those that have form and no form.' Para—Atisûkshma. Jîvas here stand for the three kinds of jîvas, Vijñânakalar, Pralayâkalar, and Sakalar.

Involution and Evolution of the Tatvas.

22. The twenty-four Tatvas, from earth to Mûla Prakriti complete their involution in the A'tma Tatva, and the six Tatvas beyond the Mûla Prakriti, in the Vidyâ Tatva; the three, Suddha Tatva upwards, in the Siva Tatva. These three, *viz.*, A'tma, Vidyâ and Siva Tatvas are eternal, say they. The other two Sakti Tatva and Siva Tatva involute in the Suddha Siva. The evolution of the Tatvas also follows the same order.

NOTE.—Siva is eternal. The other three Tatvas are so, only in name. As the Tatvas involute in and evolve from Sudda Siva, it follows that He is *the* cause of involution and evolution.

Adhikarana—4.

Creeds and their place in the Tatvas.

1. All false creeds take their stand severally in the Tatvas from Bhûtas (elements) to Mohini (Asuddha Mâyâ). The six true creeds beginning from Saiva have their respective places in the Tatvas from Vidyâ upwards. Our Lord is beyond the Tatvas.

NOTE.—False creeds are 18 in number, of which six are external, six externo-internal and the remaining six are externo-external. The names of these creeds and their explanation can be gleaned from commentaries. 'Creeds' here stand for the deities worshipped by the people who profess them. The Tatvas, which form the seats of the deities, also form the Mukti Sthâna of the creeds. 'Our Lord'-Suddha Siva, the deity of the Siddhanta Saiva Religion.

Nine kinds of Manifestation of Siva.

2. The one Lord alone acts, pervading through the nine vargas—Siva, Sakti, Nâda, and Bindu, the formless four; Sadâsiva, of form and without form; Maheswara, Rudra, Vishnu and Brahma, the four of form—who manifesting themselves in different Tatvas, perform their several functions.

NOTE.—Sakti and Bindu are included among the male energies of Siva in spite of their female character, because, unlike Manonmani and other saktis, they partake of the characteristics of both the male and the female energies in causing the manifestations.

Saktis of Siva.

3. The sakti-kinds appertaining to the manifestations of Siva are seven in number—Sakti, Bindu Sakti, Manonmani, Mahesâ, Umâ, Lakshmî and Sarasvatî. Yet they are all one, Parâsakti. Whatever aspect Her Lord manifests Himself in, in that she manifests Herself also.

NOTE.—The manifestations of Siva reckoned here are only seven; for, Sakti and Bindu have been left out, as they stand midway between the male and the female energies.

The oneness of Sakti with Siva.

4. It is Sakti who manifests Herself as Nâda and the six following vargas. It is Siva who forms all vargas from Sakti upwards. Whatever of shape there is, that proceeds from Sakti, is Sakti and Siva combined. The Sakti who manifests Herself in whatever forms the Sakta wills is His matchless consort.

The creative Power of Siva and Sakti.

5. Siva begets Sakti and Sakti begets Siva (Sâdâkya). Both in their happy union produce the worlds and the Jîvas. Still Bhava (Siva) is a brahmachâri (celibate) and the sweet-speeched Sakti remains a virgin. Sages only comprehend this secret.

The Characteristics of a Tatvajñâni.

6. The Tatvas manifesting themselves as the body, senses, worlds and enjoyments, bondage (bandha) and freedom (moksha) arising from these, affect the Jîvas. He who thus understands the nature of the Tatvas and eliminates them one by one, realises

the Supreme beyond. Such is the true sage just described.

Why Tatvas affect the Jivas.

7. Why do all these Tatvas together affect the Jîvas? It is for reaping the fruits of past Karma completely, for rooting out the very seed of Karma so that it may not arise again, and for getting rid of the evil A'nava Mala.

NOTE.—Since it is Jîvas, not Siva, that are got rid of Mala and Karma by means of the Tatvas, it follows that the Tatvas do not affect Siva.

Adhikarana–5.

Nature of A'nava Mala.

1. A'nava Mala, with its many Saktis, is one. Pervading through the numberless Jîvas as the dirt in copper, it binds them from Jñâna and Kriyâ. It also affords them the capacity for experience, and is ever the source of ignorance.

NOTE.—The dirt that is inherent in copper can be removed once for all only by alchemical processes; and, when it is so removed, the copper remains no longer copper but is transformed into replendent gold. In like manner, the Jîva that is affected by Mala can be freed from it only when Sivajñâna is attained; and the Jîva that is so freed from Mala remains no longer a Jîva but attains Patitva merging into Siva. The illustration of dirt and copper is favourite with the Siddhanta and should, therefore, be carefully noted.

A'nava and Mâyâ differentiated.

2. Do you say, 'There is no other entity as Mala (A'nava): it is only the effect of Mâyâ.' Understand well that Mâyâ causes Icchâ, Jñânâ and Kriyâ to arise in the Jîvas but A'nava causes the same to disappear, that A'nava is inherent in the Jîvas but Mâyâ is separate from them and, besides, manifesting itself as the universe, forms the body, senses, worlds and enjoyments.

NOTE.—This forms an answer to the false creeds that identify Mâyâ with A'nava Mala.

Pûrva Paksha Vâda.

3. As a black cloud hides from view the brilliant sun, so Mâyâ veils Jñâna and Kriyâ of the Jîvas. The sun begins to shine in his full glory when the cloud vanishes. So, Jñâna and Kriyâ begin to shine in the Jîvas with the dissolution of the body.

Pûrva Paksha Vâda (continued) and Siddhânta.

4. As the expansive light disappears when the cloud veils the sun, so Jñâna and Kriyâ disappear when the body screens the Jîvas.

Siddhânta. Icchâ, Jñâna and Kriyâ are manifest in the Jîvas when they are embodied. When they are not, nothing but darkness prevails.

NOTE.—'Embodied' includes both the gross and subtle bodies.

Siddhânta (continued).

5. What veils Jñâna and Kriyâ of the Jîvas is the A'nava (whose existence you ignored). Since it is commingled with the Jîvas, it may also be said to be one of their qualities. Mâyâ graciously provides the Jîvas with the Tatvas from Kala downwards, so that they may shake off the shackles of ignorance. These two, therefore, are as opposed to each other as darkness and light.

NOTE.—By commingled, it is to be understood that Mala is separable from the Jîvas and by 'one of the qualities' that it is so very intimately connected with them. The word 'also' indicates that A'nava is not a quality of the Jîvas. Vide following stanza.

Jîva and Mala differentiated.

6. Do you mean that ignorance (avidyâ) is a quality of Purusha (Jîva)? Then, Purusha should be matter. Would you say that the defect in the eye of a blind man is a quality of the eye itself? Possessing ignorance as its attribute, Mala always remains matter. But Jîva is spirit (chit) which has Jñâna for its quality.

NOTE.—It is clearly shown by the illustration that Mala is a defect, not a quality of the Jîvas.

How the three Malas act.

7. The three Malas—A'nava, Mâyâ and Karma—delusive in their character, veil the true nature of the Jîvas, and produce, in them, illusory enjoyments, bondage and capacity for experience as the sprout, bran and chaff in paddy. There are also two other Malas which we will point out presently.

NOTE.—A'nava Mala, in conjunction with the efficient cause, provides the Jîvas with the capacity for experience as the chaff is the efficient cause of sprouting. Mâyâ, being the instrumental cause, makes, with its effects—bodies and senses, the bondage of the Jîvas, as the bran favouring the growth coexists with the other ingredients. Karma, being the material cause, affords enjoyments to the Jîvas as the sprout becomes manifest by a power latent in it.

The two other Malas.

8. One is Mâyeya, which is the effect of Asuddha Maya; and the other is Trodâyî, a Sakti of the Pure that commands the three Malas to perform their respective functions. So the learned say. These five Malas stand adhered to the Jîvas.

NOTE.—Mâyeya is the Mala that limits Icchâ, Jñâna and Kriyâ of the all-pervading soul.

Reincarnation of the Jîvas.

9. The soul, affected by the five Malas—A'nava, Mâyâ, Karma, Mâyâya, and Trodâyî-passes in a moment at the good Lord's behest, through the wheels of birth and death, on earth, the higher and the lower worlds, like the whirling fire brand and the whirlwind which cease not in their motion.

NOTE.—'At the good Lord's behest' shows the agent with whose grace the escape from the wheel of birth and death can be effected.

Rareness of the human birth.

10. When we consider the case of a Jîva which, after passing through the eighty four hundred thousand kinds of yonis (embryo), of fourfold nature as Andaja, Swetaja, Utbîja and Sarâyuja, becomes human born, we can but compare it with an individual who has with his own hands swum the wide ocean.

NOTE.—It is to be noted that the human frame only is fit for the attainment of eternal freedom by the Jîvas.

Rareness of a high class human birth.

11. It is a great blessing to be born in a land where savages do not inhabit but the study of the four vedas reigns supreme. Escaping birth among the lower classes of the human race, rare is it that one should be fortunate to be born among the people privileged to perform religious austerities, and to profess the Saîva Siddhânta religion without falling into the ways of other creeds.

S. ANAVARATANAYAKAM PILLAI, M. A.

(*To be continued.*)

TA'YUMA'NAVAR'S POEMS.

(*Continued from page 202.*)

அந்தோவீ ததிசயமிச் சமயம் போலின்
றறிஞரெல்லா நடுவறிய வணிமா வாதி
வந்தாடித் திரிபவர்க்கும் பேசா மோனம்
வைத்திருந்த மாதவர்க்கு மற்று மற்றும்
இந்த்ராதி போகநலம் பெற்ற பேர்க்கு
மிதுவன்றித் தாயகம்வே றில்லை யில்லை
சந்தாந கற்பகம்போ லருளைக் காட்டத்
தக்கநெறி யிந்நெறியே தான்சன் மார்க்கம் (கசஉ)

142. O what an admirable one is th' Saiv-Siddhant!
The best and purest course to raise the souls to Heaven;
The best and purest made to invocate the Lord's grant
Of boundless Grace, which is as by Devtarús * given.
To souls advanced in tatvas twentyfive and 'leven.
Lo! This is the best munificent *faith* fit to plant.
In the minds of true jñânis to researches driven.
The high conviction that this is the mother-grant.
Alike to suit the *Sidahas*† playing in *anima* ‡
And other powers; or to great devotees drowned
In blessed silence the best concentration law;
Or to those sunk in Indra's great delights§ profound;
To all alike; to all beloved; to all the one.
Inspiring; and to all a Universal Sound.||

R. SHUNMUGAM MUDALIAR.

(*To be continued.*)

* The *devtarûs* are the wishing-trees. They yield what the owner wishes for.

† Here the saint refers to the wide accomodating charcters of the Saiva Siddhanta School of religion. Of the sages *siddhas*, *yogis*, *bhaktas* and *devoted Jñânis*, the saint mentions the first and the last, so that all the four classes of sages may be included. The order is as given above according to Drâvida Sruti.

‡ *c. f.* Notes to verse 44.

§ Indra's bhoga (sensations or sensual delights) is considered the greatest Temporal Happiness in the Universe.

|| Universal sound can be the name of this religion since it is an inviting peal to all as சேரவாருஞ்செகத்தீரே' (O ye, men of the world, come and join this), being the mother-religion to all the rest.

THE

LIGHT OF TRUTH

OR

Siddhanta Deepika.

MADRAS, MAY 1900.

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

HINDU RELIGIOUS ENDOWMENT.

The fiat of the Government of India has gone forth that there is no need for legislation, in regard to this question, and the reasons with which this conclusion is propped are really wonderful. No petti-fogging counsel could have fished out for reasons to back up their false position with greater igenuity than the Government of India, and if these principles are only to obtain, no legislation in India will be possible. It seems almost an irony of fate that hundreds of legislative enactments should be allowed to be rushed through the Council, in as short time as possible, and which affect the property and person of every one of Her Majesty's Indian subjects, and which would subject them to any amount of loss and worry and annoyance, as for instance, the Irrigation Cess Bill, and yet the Bill which *does not affect the mass of the people in the least*, and *which would alone affect a handful of men* and *these only, if they fail to do their duty*. The valuable endowments attached to these temples and mutts were mostly the gifts of kings and princes of ages gone by, and if the general body of the people do contribute anything at all, it is quite infinitesimal in value. Besides the complaint of the people is that they have so little voice in the management of these endowments, and that the members who happen to get appointed once and for life have all the thing in their own sweet way, without absolutely any check or hindrance. But like the religious cat who felt for the rats so much, the Government of India professes the tenderest regard for the religious sentiments of the people, and they are afraid that such interference must inevitably rouse the strongest resentment in the minds of those who are subjected to it? (we could produce the opinions of 90 per cent. of their trustees and committee members themselves) and who possess immense influence over the masses whom it is proposed to exclude by a property qualification from all voice in the management of their own temples" and that it "might not improbably excite a wide spread suspicion of its intentions among other religious endowments which might appear to be scandalous to Englishmen or to Natives of India inbued with our ideas, would almost certainly be regarded in an entirely different light by the great body of the Hindu worshippers who look upon an offering to a priest or a Brahman as a religious act; and it does not appear to the Governor-General in Council to be established that the mass of such worshippers *feel* any appreciable grievance in the present system of management or recognize the existence of any evil that calls for a remedy!!! And yet the Government of India is aware that the Local Government is convinced of the need for legislation, that a certain Section (?) representing a considerable body of educated and thoughtful opinion also backs up this demand and it is aware that the demands have been made in numerous addresses and memorials on the subject, and in the native press, and yet wonder of wonders the Government of India do not think it safe to infer that the general public is really in favour of such course!!! It is said that it is hard to rouse up a waking man, and no amount of reasoning is sufficient to convince the Government of India who have wilfully shut their ears to the just and earnest prayers of the people. Do the Government of India resort to any other methods for ascertaining the public opinion in regard to other measures they themselves are determined. Are they prepared to leave the working of the Government machinery itself and that of the most of Local and Municipal Boards to be taken of by the public spirit of the people. Do they think that the interest of the public at large in the Local and Municipal institutions is less than in the case of these Temples and would they advocate universal franchise in their case? As it is, it is useless and hopeless to argue with the Government and it is only left to the people to convince the Government in only one way—to get up monster memorials from one end of the country to the other, and it is even a question if the Government of India will not even then find some reason for rejecting such Memorials.

We suggest a small and short memorial and in the following form to be adopted everywhere :—

To

His Excellency the Governor-General and Viceroy of India in Council.

We the undersigned memorialists representing the Hindu Population beg to approach you with the following prayer :—

(1) We are throughly convinced that the Hindu Religious endowments are thoroughly mismanaged and that the defective provisions of Act 20 of 1863 is altogether responsible for it and that public have no manner of control over these endowments.

(2) That the managers and trusties, both hereditary and otherwise should be compelled to furnish accounts to District or Local Committees and that the accounts should be subject to audit by a qualified auditor and that the Committee should also be made to publish such accounts with the result of such audit in the District Gazette.

(3) We therefore earnestly pray that the Act of 20 of 1863 be at once amended to contain these vital provisions.

We beg to remain,
Your most dutiful servants.

District.	Town.	Village.	Street.
Door No.	Father's Name.	Name.	Occupation.

The Last Convocation Address of the Madras University.

We cannot praise in sufficient terms the Splendid address dilivered by the Hon'ble Mr. Nicholson. The address brims full of useful hints and sage advice in every line and one has to study it with considerable thought and attention. The Hon'ble is a specialist in Agricultural questions, and he has not studied it in any purely acadamic spirit, but with a spirit of sympathy and thorough knowledge of the actual requirements of the masses of the people. He has done no little to move Government in the path of agricultural reform and the amelioration of the conditions of the people and his advice to the people themselves and the leaders of the people (but the Government of India would seem to set so little value to the words of their leaders!) should be carefully treasured up and worked out. But one thing we may that the recently passed irrigation cess act will paralyse all effort at agricultural improvement and that the losses to the people and to the Government itself will far outweigh the anticipated gains.

***

The following paras we cull from a book called "The Woodlands in Europe" intended for Christian Readers; and we could not produce better arguments for the truth of our Conception of the supreme Siva, the Destroyer and the creater and the Preserver (Vide p 6. Sivagnanabotham English Edition.)

"And how about the dead leaves which, season after season, strew the ground beneath the trees? Is their work done because, when their bright summer life is over, they lie softly down to rest under the bare wintry boughs.? Is it only death, and nothing beyond? Nay; if it is death, it is death giving place to life. Let us call it rather change, progress, transformation. It must be progress, when the last year's leaves make the soil for next year's flowers, and in so doing serve a set purpose and fulfil a given mission. *It must be transformation, when one thing passes into another, and, instead of being annihilated, begins life again in a new shape and form.*

It is interesting to remember that the same snow which weighs down and breaks those fir branches is the nursing mother of the flowers. Softly it comes down upon the tiny seeds and the tender buds and covers them up lovingly, so that from all the stern rigour of the world without they are safely sheltered. Thus they are getting forward, as it were, and life is already swelling within them; so that when the sun shines and the snow melts they are ready to burst forth with a rapidity which seems almost Miraculous.

It is not the only force gifted with both preserving and destroying power, according to the aspect in which we view it. The fire refines and purifies, but it also destroyes; and the same water which rushes down in the cataract with such over-whelming power, falls in the gentlest of drops upon the thristy flower cup and fills the hollow of the leaf with just the quantity of dew which it needs for its refreshment and sustenance. And in those higher things of which nature is but the type and shadow, the same grand truth holds good; and from our Bibles we learn that *the consuming fire, and the love that passeth knowledge are but different sides of the same God:—just, and yet merciful; "that will by no means clear the guilty, yet showing mercy unto thousands.*

REVIEWS.

DRAVIDA PRAKASIKA*

We welcome this publication as containing the valuable results of a life study by one of the very few learned Tamil scholars of to-day. He is also a learned Sanskritist and is fully versed in the great treatises of his Master, Sri Sivagnana Yogi; and he is one of the very few who have studied the Yogi's great Dravida Bashiyam.

In his book, he displays considerable ability and critical acumen; but we are afraid the language he uses towards those whom he differs from is not at all becoming in these days, however much they might have been tolerated by old usage. This is the blot in his book and we hope it will be remedied in a future edition. The book is also printed in too small letters. The subject deserves better typography and the question of cost should not stand in the way as this is a book intended for the educated classes and not for the ignorant poor.

In the book, he reviews the whole body of Tamil Literature rather too briefly, we regret, and he divides his subject into four chapters, entitled—"Ilakkana Marabial" (Gramatical works) Ilakkia Marabial (Literary works) Sathira Marabial (Philosophical works) and "Oribial" (other works) and in the introduction he disourses the question of the ancient character of the Tamil Language and literature. He thinks "Tamil" means "இனிமை" 'sweet' but a word may come to obtain a number of meanings, but the root meaning may after all be different and it does not therefore justify the dogmatism and warmth which our author displays. He holds that Tamil Grammar is independent of Sanskrit Grammar and there can be no doubt about it. He gives a learned note on the

*By Srilasri K. Sabapathi Navalar Avl. of Chidambaram. 1899 Price Rs. 2.

first sut a of Tolgappia, the first cural of Tiruvalluvar, the first verse of Periah Purana and the introductory verses in Sivagnanabotham. He is convinced that the Philosophy as indicated in these Tamil work is clearly the Advaita Siddhanta and not the Mayavada Vedanta, and that this is also our view we have expressed on several occasions.

The book is unique of its kind and supplies a long-felt want and ought to be popular. The style is not too difficult to be followed by an ordinarily well educated student of Tamil. Our Navalar deserves to be congratulated on the whole on the useful and learned work he has brought out.

2. Sivakshetrâlaya Mahôtsava Unmai Vilkkam*
(சிவக்ஷேத்திராலய மகோற்சவ உண்மை விளக்கம்).

3. Saiva Bhushana Chandrika*

Sri Panchâkshara Rahasyam†
(ஸ்ரீ பஞ்சாக்ஷர ரகசியம்)

We highly commend these books to all our readers and they form very useful and important hand books on the subject as treated therein. The first book gives the meaning of the symbolism of all the Forms in our Temple as also the meaning of the various festivals, &c.; and what we are bound to say these meanings have been arrived after considerable study and texts are quoted from most of our religious and philosophical works to bear out these meanings. With regard to the car-feast, we ourselves discovered the meaning by a chance, and we sounded many a Pundit to discover this meaning, and not one gave this meaning, though several suggestions were made, and we are glad to find that this very meaning is given by our Pundit in this book. We only instance this to show with what great care and knowledge the subject is approached.

In Saiva Bushna chandrika, the same author treats on the meaning, uses and texts bearing on the question of the sacred ashes, sacred beads, and Rudraksha and accordingly the volume is very highly useful to all Saivas. From the several texts quoted from the Tiruvaimozi it will be seen that the authors of those sacred Hymns were still conforming to the general usage of wearing Holy ashes, and the custom of wearing *namam* had not come into use in their time.

"கரியமேனி மிசை வெளியநீறு சிறிதேயிடும்
பெரியகோலத்தடங்கண்ணன்."

"ஏறியபித்தினொடெல்லா உலகுங்கண்ணன் படைப்
பென்னும்
நீறுசெவ்வே யிடக்காணி னெடுமாலடியா
ரென்றோடும்"

"மணியிலணி நிறமாயன் றமரணி நீறுகொண்டு
அணியமுயலின் மற்றில்லைகண்டீ ரிவ்வணங்குக்கே"

These are not spurious texts but any edition of the book will be found to contain these verses.

* By N. Kadiraivêl Pillai of Jaffna Price 6 As. and 4 as. each. Madras Ripon Press, and V. N. JUBILEE PRESS, respectively.

† By Srimath Balasaraswati Gnananantha Swamigal of Sri Manickavasagaswamigal A'dhinam. Price As. 4. STAR OF INDIA PRESS, MADRAS.

The book on Panchakshara is planned on the same model, and ought to be of the Highest value to all our readers.

We congratulate these two authors on the excellent books they have brought out and we hope their efforts will be continued in works of similar character.

5. A hand book on Agricultural science (in Ten Parts) Part I.*

Our friend and brother is always engaged in doing some useful work; and the books he has brought out in Tamil comprise all sorts of useful subjects, and will form a library by itself. The latest work which he has given to the public is his book on agriculture, and the part now before us contains so much information that we thought at first this was the whole book. But nine parts more are to come and we may feel sure therefore in getting a most useful and comprehensive book on Agriculture; and this book by the ways shows also that it will not be difficult to write Tamil books on science. In his preface, the author greatfully acknowledge the valuable help and advice he received from the Hon'ble Mr. Nicholson, and it will not too much to ask that government will also show their appreciation of the learned authors disinterested work by substantially helping him. In the meanwhile we beg to tender him our warmest thanks on behalf of the sorely stricken down agricultural population.

EXTRACTS.

A PLEA FOR LESS DOGMATISM IN PUBLIC TEACHING.

We extract the following article from *the Theosophical Review*, which almost sums up our own attitude towards the Theosophical movement.

In one of her recent lectures Mrs. Besant told us that if any of the leaders of the Society adopted a course of action, which to the best of our judgment was prejudicial to its interests, it was our duty to protest. No other apology or justification, therefore, will be necessary for what may appear the presumptuous criticism I am about to make with regard to the policy of the Theosophical Society. Let the assurance suffice, however, that in doing so I am acting in what I believe to be the highest interests of the Society.

Briefly put, my experience has led me irresistibly to the conclusion that many teachings which are put forward publicly should, if taught at all, be reserved for private instruction; that these teachings militate against the use of the Theosophical Society by repelling those who would accept its more important ethical doctrines; further, that the teaching I refer to are absolutely of no use to the evolution of the race, inasmuch as they benefit nobody. In thus criticising the wisdom of our leaders, nay, it may be even of the Masters for aught I know, I am aware that I shall call down upon my head the censure of many an earnest Theosophist, who will doubtless be shocked by my apparent presumption. That, however, cannot be helped, nor does it deter me from what I believe to be a duty. Besides, are we not told that H. P. B. herself "strenu-

*By S. P. Narasimhalu Naidu Crescent Press, Coimbatore 1900.

ously asserted the right and the duty of each to use his own intellect and judgment and not to accept blindly the authority of any writer"? I am also aware that the departure from the methods hitherto pursued by the Society which I would suggest, would constitute a far-reaching and momentous change in its policy; one, however, I am firmly convinced, that would redound both to the good of the Society and to mankind.

To my major premise, that the Society exists in order to help on the spiritual evolution of the race, of course no exception will be taken, for that is its avowed object. Well, then, that being so, it stands to reason that representatives of the Society, in their capacity as such, whether by pen or tongue, should only teach truths which will subserve that end; my point is, however, that they should advance them unencumbered by dogmas and speculations which make no appeal to the reason, resting, as they do, solely on the *ipse dixit* of individual writers.

For our purpose Theosophical teachings may be divided into four classes:

1. Those which accord with our intuitions, and explain the phenomena of nature by giving us the law of which we have been in search—generalisations which our experiences and observations not only prepare us to accept, but which it seems we might almost ourselves have deduced.

2. Such as we might infer from what we know of the manifestations of life on this plane—inferring the causes from the effects we see here.

3. Truths we might arrive at by arguing from analogy—namely by postulating that the laws operative on the physical plane also condition to some extent the manifestations of the One Life on the higher planes.

These three classes of teachings might receive a tentative, if not ready acceptance, by any thinker, however unfamiliar he might be with other occult truths. Not so however with the next class:

4. Teachings which include those dogmas which must be accepted *solely* on some authority—which explain no phenomena within our cognisance, solve no problems, which could not be inferred, for which it can scarcely be said any analogy exists on the physical plane, and which, finally, are of no *practical* use to anybody.

The first three include, moreover, all the most important and fundamental teachings of Theosophy—all those which are calculated in any way to accelerate human evolution; they include all the ethical and moral teachings such as those of karma, reincarnation, final union with God, etc., just those which the modern world stands in such dire need of, just those which, giving pause to the selfish pursuit of wealth and pleasure, would lead to a higher spirituality by revealing the *purpose* of life.

But, and this is the fact I wish to emphasise, these truths will not spread and receive the ready acceptance they might, *so long as they are intermixed with dogmas which merely constitute a tax on the credulity of inquirers.* It is all very well to say let them accept some and reject others, but that is just what they will not do. It is only the fairly advanced who are content to be eclectic; the vast majority must either accept *all* or reject *all*. If along with teachings which seems so reasonable that they almost compel conviction, there are presented others which seems to those unfamiliar with them nothing less than grotesque, the chances are that all the good that might have accrued from the acceptance of the former will be stultified, for both will be rejected. Besides, it is surely the object of the Society to attract as many enquirers as possible, and when attracted to keep them, by laying before them only such teachings as are calculated to lead them to further and further self-initiated study. And, above all things, if the Society is to be of any extended use it must avoid frightening away the coy enquirer by *seeming* even to require the acceptance of what to them can but be fantastic theories and speculations.

I admit that the teachings which would come under my fourth heading have attractions for certain minds, but it seems to me it is not the type of mind we should most desire to appeal to. They, namely those we should thus attract, are not the hard-headed practical people who are doing the work of the world; they are not the people who are the leaders of thought, who are moulding opinion; they include neither the intellectual nor philanthropical classes. I hesitate to say it, but it cannot I think be denied, they *do* include the "credulous." On the other hand, by confining ourselves to such as come under classes 1, 2, 3, we should appeal to the most spirituallyminded and most intellectual amongst the outside world. Many, I doubt not, who, under the influence of Theosophical teachings would have accomplished great things for humanity, have been attracted by its sublime ethical doctrines only to be repelled from further enquiry by the demands made, as they thought, on their credulity. Would that these ethical doctrines, divested of all dogma, save those absolutely necessary as premises on which to base them, might be presented to the world in a form acceptable to it! I cannot but think that such would also fulfil the intentions of the founders of the Society, for did not one of them say: "The chief object of the Theosophical Society is not so much to gratify individual aspirations *as to serve our fellow-men.*"

In the introduction to her *Ancient Wisdom*, Mrs. Besant says: "Right thought is necessary to right conduct, right understanding to right living." Quite so—but only up to a certain point. The foregoing quotation may very well be construed as implying that *all* right thought and understanding is necessary to *any* right conduct. Whether Mrs. Besant meant this or not, I do not know, but so it may be understood. This, of course, would be a fallacy. No knowledge of astronomy, for example, is necessary to play the piano. So to act and live rightly I require the right understanding of *some* things but not *all* things. It cannot *matter* to me whether there are planetary chains, manvantaras, and so forth; if there are I shall know it by direct knowledge when it is necessary that I should, until then the *belief* that there are is of no use whatever to me. Let us recognise that the teachings which have no direct influence or bearing on life are *useless*, nay, perhaps mischievous, if exoterically given out. Such teaching it would seem to me should be restricted to an inner circle—to those, *i.e.*, who desire such knowledge—but should not be flaunted before a sceptical world; for, by so doing, as I have already said, we repel many of the most eligible of those who are not already within our ranks.

E. MARTIN WEBB.

EXTRACTS.

The following we take from the Sanskrit Journal, as it will prove of interest to our readers.

Mons. A. Barth, Honorary member of the Royal Asiatic Society, Member of the French Institute, the distinguished French *Savant* thus writes of the *Sandhyávandanam* and *Purushasuktam*, which originally appeared in our journal.

Paris.—6, *Dec.* 1899.

...... "Both papers are exceedingly well done. They do much credit to the learning and healthy feelings of Professor Kamesvara Aiyar. No doubt, there are many passages we should translate otherwise in the West, and, as the learned author is well aware, our general view of the subject in both cases would also be somewhat different. But the whole of Vedic interpretation is still so widely open to controversy, that any sensible man must be glad to hear what Hindu scholars and enlightened Hindu patriots of our days have to say about the monuments of their past, the more so if, as in the present case, these monuments be still in holy use and a part of their actual liturgy......Therefore no friend of India will deny his sympathy to Professor Kamesvara Aiyar doing his best endeavours to restore in a scholarly manner the Sandhyavandana to its Vedic purity or even trying to bring it up to date. But at the same time the foreigner will have the right of considering from without what the house-born heir is considering from within. The standing of both being different, the conclusions cannot on all points be the same.

I shall not dwell on minor discrepancies; yet I must give you some samples. On the whole it may be said that we feel ourselves less at liberty with grammar and vocabulary than does the learned professor, on the authority, it is true, of most able commentators. Thus for an instance, *yad annenátirohati* (Purushasukta 2) will never mean with us what is made out of it in the translation. Thus again, *Punantu Brahmanaspatih Brahmapúta Punátu Mám* would not be styled by us as a grammatical puzzle, but sheer nonsense, as it stands, and therefore a *prima facie* corruption.

But I have no space to sift any longer such minute particulars, and must turn to some topics of a more general purport.

Professor Kamesvara Aiyar overrates, methinks, the consent of our Western scholars about Vedic matters. There are rather many points, not only of particular bearing, but vast and far-reaching ones, about which there is no agreement among them. Take, for instance, caste. The opinion that there were no castes in Rigvedic times is far from being held unanimously among us. I, for my part, did never accept it, and I doubt much whether any of our younger scholars would maintain the main point that the *Purushasukta* must be late because caste is mentioned in it. There is in the Avesta a fair counterpart of your *varnas* and comparative ethnology teaches us that restrictions like those of caste have their roots in the very lowest *strata* of primitive society. But not only you have caste, you have a theory of caste also; and it is this theory, not caste itself, which seems late to most of us. It cannot be traced back further than the Brahmanas and just in the Purushasukta there is a great bit of it. This alone would be no proof. But there are concomitant facts. Neither *vaicya* nor *sudra* are Rigvedic words; even *kshatriya* is not one in the sense it is taken here. Much more, the whole tenor of the Sukta is not Rigvedic. There is not in it a single construction, not a single word which is not found also in later documents. What we have here is not a greater polish of style, but rather another language, the language, namely, of the Brahmanas, that is to say, almost classical Sanskrit. And what may be said of the language holds of the ideas also. They are on the same level with Bráhmanas and Upanishads. And this brings me to the Vedantic character of the Sukta.

The cosmological myth exposed in the Sukta, that of the world being framed out of the limbs of a primeval giant, is a very old one, and, though not found elsewhere in the Rigveda, much older, like caste, than any Vedic text; for it occurs also in other related but distant mythologies, as for instance, in that of the Scandinavians. But in the Purushasukta, beyond all doubt, it is no more taken in its literal meaning; it has become a mere symbol and as such it is fraught thoroughly with Vedantic speculation. So far I agree altogether with Professor Kamesvara Aiyar. But I must part from him when, for his Cankara. In my opinion the illustration of the Sukta, and I illustration of the Sukta he goes straight to the Vedanta of may immediately add, of most of the motely *Mantras* gathered in the Sandhyavandana, is not to be drawn from the complex and refind system of the later school but rather from the Vadanta of the Upanishads, wheih nearer as they come to our texts are also fraught with equally crude and incoherent symbolism. I need but to mention their theories of the Pranas, of the Purusha in the eye, in the sun, in the heart and the arteries, of Prajapati *androgyne* &c., &c.

And thus from chronology, we are brought again to the question of interpretation: for proceeding by this way, the one consistent with historical criticism, we shall not, as is often done in Professor Kamesvara Aiyar's translation, cloak by the phraseology of another age passages such as Purusha

Sukta 5, a riddle—there are many riddles in the Veda—expressing the theory of evolution in its crudest form. Neither shall we, even through the commentary of Sayana, search in *Uttara Purushasukta* (p. 92-93) for some postulates of nineteenth century science, nor on the authority of another commentator understand the Supreme Lord, when the waters are spoken of (Sandhyavandanam, p. 21).

Incidentally I may add that in Rigveda III, 59,3 (Sandhyavandanam 94-98) and Rigveda VII, 89, I (*Ibidem* p-99) the transmigration of souls is the last thing to be thought of. *Amhas*, in the first passage, has its etymological meaning of *anguish*, *danger*, and the *house of* clay in the second passage is clearly the grave; for burial was in use as well as cremation in Rigvedic times. The belief in transmigration is certainly a very old one, but strange as it may be, till now, it has not been traced in the hymns.

In all such passages methinks the learned author deals too profusely with the gunpowder and sparks......But I am glad to add......that a great deal of pure and steady light has been shed by him on Hindu religious tradition. If he fails often to give us the original meaning of the *Mantras*, a meaning of which in many cases nobody can boast now to have more than a faint glimpse, he has fully succeeded in giving us, of these old prayers what through many centuries the greatest of Hindu scholars have searched for and found in them.

TAMIL PHILOLOGY.

The second article on Tamil Philology from the pen of Pandit Savarirayan is equally interesting and instructive, but we are afraid that even here he has made some suggestions which are open to reasonable criticism. We are not in any way dogmatic about our opinions, and any remarks we may make are only in a friendly spirit and with a view to thrash out the truth. Where our Pandit is found to step beyond the limits of Tamil philology into the field of comparative philology or etymology, there especially does he give expression to opinions to which we are constrained to take objection. The following observations with respect to certain points touched upon in the article under reference, will not, in our humble expectation, fail to throw some additional light, or at least to stir up mightier minds to make careful researches in this disgracefully neglected field of Tamil Philology.

Great credit is indeed due to Professor Seshagiri Sastri and Pandit Savarirayan for their bold and untiring efforts to dig up Tamil roots, which we hope will be crowned with brilliant success. It is gratifying to learn that an Etymological Dictionary of the Tamil language and a treatise on the "Ancient Tamilian Race" will shortly appear as the results of the labours of these two scholars respectively.

We hope that in the Tamil-English Dictionary which is being compiled by C. W. Cathiravel Pillai Esq., retired Police Magistrate of Kayts, Jaffna, the etymology of words will not be overlooked, and that, where one and the same word has several meanings, the arrangement of them will be in the order of their development. It is a matter of regret that most of our Pandits with all their fund of knowledge are too dogmatic and narrow-minded to be convinced that every word in language owes its existence to some root or roots pregnant with sense.

Even the grammatical framework or the formal elements of our language ought to be the remains of independent words with palpable meanings. In monosyllabic or radical languages as the Chinese, the functions of the terminations are performed by separate words, for instance, plurality is expressed by some word denoting heap, class, kind, flock, cloud, &c.

In his sixth lecture on the science of Language, Vol. I, Prof. Max Muller dwells at length on this subject, and we quote the following.

"The whole, or nearly the whole, grammatical framework of the Aryan or Indo-European languages, has been traced back to original independent words, and even the slightest changes which at first sight seem so mysterious, such as *foot* into *feet* or *I find* into *I found* have been fully accounted for."

What applies to the terminations of the Aryan languages should with equal truth apply to those of the Dravidian or Tamilian languages.

The latter family of languages being in the agglutinative stage, the formal elements in it are not so worn out as in inflectional languages. It would be well for students of comparative grammar of the Tamilian languages to bear this fact in mind, and to do as much as in their power lies to bring to light the original meanings of these elements. Some may however suppose that the grammatical framework of a language is the

result of *crystalline accretion or †germinal development, and not of phonetic corruption, but this view is however untenable in the face of the weighty arguments adduced to the contrary by Prof. Max Muller. In illustration of our statement that all Tamil words are traceable to roots or radicals, let us here carefully examine நிலம் and நீர், which are generally instanced as இடுகுறிப்பெயர் or arbitrary-primitives. Before trying to reduce these names to roots, a clear understanding of what roots are, is very essential. Prof. Max Muller explains as follows: "We call *root* or *radical* whatever in the words of any language or family of languages, cannot be reduced to a simpler or more original form." He further says that the root of a word is its *unchangeable remnant* as distinguished from its *changeable termination*. Roots are either predicative or demonstrative, as

(1) *Mar*—to grind, to rub, to stroke, to wear out, or to wither away, found in English *Mill, Meal* and *Milk;* Latin *Mors* = Death or *Decay of frame,* and *Mora*=Delay or *loss of time;* and in Sans. *Mrityu* (மிருத்தியு) Death, *Maruts* (மருத்து) wind and *Máruta* (மாருதம்) storm.

(2) *Ta*—this or there, in Gothic *Thata*, Greek *To* neuter of Definite article, Latin *te, ta, tud* (in Iste, Ista and Istud) and English *the, that, this, they* and *then.* All roots are necessarily monosyllabic and are divisible into three classes, namely, primitive roots, secondary roots and tertiary roots, a full description of which appears in Prof. Max Muller's seventh lecture, Vol. I.

Primitive roots, which consist of

(1) One vowel as *i* in Latin *ire to go,*

(2) One vowel and one consonant as *ad* in Latin *Edere*, Greek *Edein*, Sanskrit *ad* and English *Eat* or

(3) One consonant and one vowel as *da* in Latin *dare* to give, Latin *donum* and Sanskrit *dânam*=gift, are very numerous in languages in the first and second stages. Moreover a root may be strengthened by the insertion of some letter as N. E. G. *ud=und* to be moist *yug=yung* to join. Similarly the Tamil root அட் *ad* in * அடு adu=to join has been changed into அண்ட் *and* in அண்டு.

This new root *and* appears however in a weakened form in † அண்ணுகிறது to reach, owing to the assimilating power of n (ண்). Cf. the corruption of ஒன்று one into ஒண்ணு and மூன்று into மூணு. Practically d has been

* Those who consider that language was made by mutual agreement say that the terminations are unmeaning signs added to the body of a word to modify its meaning.

† Frederick Schlegel and Rev. Farrar think that words are endowed with a principle of growth. Such an idea is involved in the grammatical nomenclature பகுதி (Sans. Prakriti) and விகுதி (Sans. Vikriti).

* A careful study of Professor Max Muller's Lecture on Phonetic Change fully impresses on our mind that the confusion among the consonants K, P, and T, the triad of Grimm's law, is not a matter of fiction but of facts and figures. In the worthy Professor's opinion, this change among the gutturals, labials and dentals is due to a previous state of language in which the two or three principal points of consonantal contact were not yet felt as definitely separated from each other." The Polynesian Dialects are reported to have not yet got over this difficulty and consequently to vary not only their words but even their *roots*. As examples of this change which at first sight appears wonderful, we may quote from the Indo-European stock, the Sans. Gharma (கருமம்) heat, the Gr: Therme=heat, and the Lat: Formous=hot, and from the Tamil language கொப்புள் (originally a bubble தொப்புள் and பொக்குள் (vulgo) navel. What we want to prove here is that this law which holds good with regard to words holds equally good with regard to roots of which alone all languages were originally made up. The Polynesian Dialects fully bear out the truth of our contention. The root *ad* which we have in view is therefore traceable to *ot* the radix of ஒரு—one and may be identified with *ap* in அப்புகிறது, properly to make one, hence to put on, &c., of which அப்பம் a pancake is probably a derivative. The Malayan apam—cake is evidently unoriginal. ஒடு or ஒட்டு is directly from root *ot*—to unite. The root *ot* is clearly visible in ஒக்கிறது to resemble, to be equal, ஒக்கல் a tribe affinity, or the hip (the middle part of the human body) and in ஒப்பு likeness or *symmetry* of body.

† அண்ணுமலை, the name of a mountain in the South Arcot District, which is sacred to Siva, is shown by Dr. Rottler to be a compound of அண்ணு not reached (by Brahma and Vishnu), and மலை mountain. But it is more probable that this word is a corruption of அருணசலம், the Tamil மலை being substituted for the Sans. Achalam. Such changes are not of rare occurrence. In the Kaddukulampattu west (of the Trincomalie District, Ceylon) which is peopled by the Sinhalese who are daily being Tamilised in their habits, manners, dress and speech, there are several tank-names which appear in duplicates—the one being Sinhalese and the other Tamil or partly Tamil; E. G. Nikkaveva நொச்சிக்குளம் Tavulaveva-தவாற்குளம் properly தாவளக்குளம், The change of அருண into அண்ண is as feasible as that of வருணம் colour into வண்ணம்.

It is but quite natural that whenever the original form of a word has been obscured by phonetic decay, the human mind craving after some explanation assigns a meaning to suit the word in its altered garb. This is how popular mythology or etymology crops up, and we would refer the reader to the XII lecture of Pof. Max Muller's Science of Language, Vol. II. Arunâchalam as well as Sonagiri (சோணகிரி) another name for Annamalai, means the *red mountain* or செம்மலை.

lost and *an* (அண்) discarding the second *n* the remnant of *d* assumes the duties of root, and is more prolific than its parent *ad*. If not for the connecting link அண்டு it would have been quite impossible to establish the relationship between the two roots. The existence of two roots like *and* and *an* should not in any way lead us to suppose that the latter is an apocopated form of the former. Roots are liable to modification but not to such wear and tear; for instance the root *yu*-to mingle, has grown up to *yug*-to join, which has been further modified into *judh*-to fight, in order to mark the distinction between these meanings.

The Sans. root *tud*-to strike, is the parent of the following:—Tup, Tubh, Tuph, Tug, Tur, Turo, Tuh and Tus (Vide page 305 Science of language by Prof. Max Muller. Vol. I.)

A. Now coming to the words which we proposed to analyse, நிலம் when stripped of its changeable termination or noun suffix leaves behind நில். This remnant is identical with நில் to stand. Here we have a clear case of how the Aryans and the Tamilians concurred in their general idea about a place or *station*. The Sanskrit words *sthala* and *sthâna* meaning a place, and the Latin *statio*, the original of the English Station and which means a post, station or abode, are respectively derived from the Sans. *stha*-to stand, and Lat. *sto*-to stand, both of which are represented by root *sta*. The English *stand* is also obtained from this root. The original meaning of நிலம் is therefore *something to stand upon* or a place, and hence the seat or abode of man. We might also explain the word in a different way. As the ancients believed the earth to be *stationary*, they might have given this name to distinguish it from the sun and moon *both* of which were in their opinion moving bodies. The offshoots of this Tamil root are a legion, a few of which are well worth considering here. நிலவு is evidently derived from நில் as செலவு from செல் and உணவு from உண். This word was probably first used to denote the bright half of the moon's age *when it is visible or present*, as distinguished from the dark half or மறைவு; hence the meanings of moonlight and, by metonymy, moon. As a verb it means to shine. நிலவு is a word which, in spite of phonetic corruption, holds its ground. Unlike புறவு-dove (from புறவம்-an older name for the bird which lives in a புறவம் or forest-a place *outside* the town limits) and சுறவு-shark (so called perhaps on account of its *nutritive nature*-சுரக்கப்பண்ணுந்தன்மை) which are met with only in books, நிலவு and its comrade இரவு (properly இறவு—verbal noun from இற-to go down, to die or disappear. இரவு is the time when the sun *disappears, dies or goes down*) have not as yet been driven to the wall in the struggle for existence with நிலா and இரா. நிலா conveys all the meanings that நிலவு does, and might have given rise to the verb நிறக்கிறது-to shine or to be of brilliant colour, from which comes நிறம் (1) light or splendour, (2) colour (3) natural temperament or disposition of the body, complexion, and hence (4) the seat of disposition—the breast. The process of transformation in question would be as follows:— நிலா = நிரா = நிறு = நிற. One of the meanings of நிலவு or நிலா is month. In this sense, it is still current in the Telugu language where Nela takes the place of Nilâ. In almost all the languages, the names for month are derived from the moon. For instance, the English month or the Anglo-Saxon monadh is traceable to A S. mona or moon; the Sans. Mâsa comes from mas: Moon; in Gr. Men=Month, Menu=Moon. In Ger: Menoths=a month, mond—moon; and in Dutch maand and maan are the respective terms. All these words for moon or month, as well as the Latin Mensis—Month, have sprung up from a root ma=to measure "for time was measured by nights and moons and winters long before it was reckoned by days and suns and years."

Regarding the form of the Latin word for month Cicero says that the courses of the moon are called *menses* (months) because they produce measured(*mensa*) spaces. "Lunae cursus qui quia mensa spatia conficiunt menses nominantur." The Tamil மதி from which மாதம் is derived, serves this double purpose. That the moon played an important part as measurer of time is further attested by the Tamil or rather Sanskrit names for the months of the year. These months are named each after its full moon day Thus தை or Sans. தைஷ after the asterism தை or பூசம் on which the full moon falls in that month, மாசி Sans. மாகம் after மகம், &c. We should indeed be very glad to hear from any Tamil scholar the pure Tamil names of the months of the year. நிலை in the sense of time is perhaps due to நிலா=moon. In view of the fact that the English month was christened after the moon, the expressions '*lunar month*' for a lunation and '*solar month*' for a Calendar month are as erroneous as the Tamil அமைரஞாட்கயிறு and தேங்காய் எண்ணெய். There is no doubt that such pleon-

astic and inconsistent word-collocations are due to the ignorance of the original ideas of words on the part of those who first used such phrases.

To return from the digression, the root நில் becomes நிற் in நிறு, நிறுவு and நிறை. The primary signification of நிறு is to stand or to raise, hence to know the weight of anything by *lifting it up*. Every man is furnished by nature, so to speak, with a pair of scales which he uses whenever the human contrivance is not at hand. According to Prof. Skeat the English *weigh* conveys an identically same original sense. He derives it from the A. S. wegan--to carry, bear, raise or lift. Cf. to weigh anchor. Its root is *wagh* which is closely allied to the Latin. *Vehere*, and Sans. *Vah* to carry, of which Lat. Vehiculum (Eng. Vehicle) and Sans. Vâhana are derivatives respectively.

Rev: Stormouth thinks, however, that the *wagging* motion of the balance is the cause of the form *weigh*.

If affords us much pleasure to note here that the Tamil language is *rich* in radical metaphors or 'poetry in words'; and this fact is borne testimony to by the different shades of meaning expressed by many a single word. For example நிறை (verbal noun from நிறு—to weigh, &c.) means :—

1. Stability or indestructibility, an idea quite in consonance with the origin of the verb.
2. An *established* custom
3. Weight
4. The sign *Libra*
5. Limit or boundary
6. *Balance* of justice or equity
7. Chastity, which consists in *stability* of character or the power either to *stop* the mind from going astray or to *fix* it in the path of morality

Cf: சிறைகாக்குங் காப்பெவன் செய்யு மகளிர் -
நிறைகாக்குங் காப்பே தலை.

We might also identify chastity with moral *rectitude* or *weight* or with *justice, perfection* or *fulness* of wisdom. With நிறை compare கற்பு which by origin means learning or knowledge, as in the phrase "கற்பிலா மூர்க்கர்" fools devoid of knowledge. Do not these words disclose as much wisdom or grandeur of thought as the English chastity which is derived from the Lat. Castus-clean or pure. Archbishop Trench goes the length of connecting castus with Lat. candeo and making chastity synonymous with *whiteness* (an emblem of purity). நிறை-to fill, is attributable to the fact that a full jar *does not shake* or does retain, if we are allowed the expression, a *balance-like* equilibrium. நிழல் or நீழல் is probably traceable to நிலா, and hence the meanings of (1) light (2) shadow which is an inseparable adjunct of light (3) coolness (4) shelter or protection (5) prosperity (6) illness the relation of which to health is as that of shadow to light. நீள் (ஒளி) is perhaps derived from this word.

For the change of ல into ழ compare பழம் with பலம் where the transformation takes place in an inverse order. By the way, we may state here that Dr. Rottler and A. Kumaraswami Pillai, the author of இலக்கணச் சந்திரிகை, have fallen into the error of supposing that these words are copies of the Sanskrit Phala-fruit. The existence in Tamil of such forms as பழு—to ripen, பழ-ripened or old, பாழ்-old or rotten, பழுது-damage or fault, பழி-fault, and பழுவம்-a desert is clear proof that பழம் is a noun formed from the root of பழு with suffix அம்.

B. நீர் is one of the few words which are common to the Aryan and Tamilian languages. In Tamil it is not a duplicate of the Sans. Nîra which Dr. Rottler has shewn it to be. The reasons for claiming a Tamil parentage are these :

(1) This word forms an element in most of the compositions of daily use, as இளநீர்-cocoanut water, உமிநீர்-spittle, குடிநீர்-water to drink or a decoction, குளிநீர்-water to bathe, கழுநீர்–water in which rice has been washed, வெந்நீர்-warm water, நீர்க்கரை-river side, நீரடைப்பு-dysury, நீர்க்கால்=watercourse, and a lot of others. If நீர் be not a native term, all these words ought to be hybrids which is not very probable. (2). Except நீர், there are at present in the Tamil language no native words which denote water. (3). Nî (நீ) the root of நீர் stands out in bold relief in such a pure Tamil word as நீக்குகிறது, நீந்துகிறது or நீஞ்சுகிறது-to swim. These forms correspond exactly to தூங்கு-to hang, முந்து-to go before, and மிஞ்சு-to be in excess, which are respectively derived from தூ=to hang, மூ-before, and மீ-over. The Greek Neros-wet, Nereus-the sea-god by that name, and Nereis-idos-daughter of Nereus, are derived from the root Na or

* sua which we find in the Greek Neo and Lat. No- to swim; hence, it is evident that the original notion about water is something to *bathe* or *swim in*. The ர் in நீர் represents the noun suffix இர் which occurs in மயிர் (மை+இர்) உயிர் (உய்+இர்) பயிர் (பை+இர்) and several other names. Among the derivatives of the Aryan root *na* or *sna* are the following :—Gr. Naus, Lat. Navis, Sans. Nau, and A. S. Naca=ship, of which the first three words have respectively produced (1) nausea, nautilus (2) navy, nave (body of a church) navigation, and (3) navya (நாவாய்). நவ்வு and நவ்வி are on the face of them Tamilised forms of the Sans: nau. The Tamil radical நீ has also been productive of some nautical terms. For example, நீகான் and நீகாமன்-pilot or shipmaster, are evidently derived from நீகம்-a Tamil name for water, and appear to have anciently conveyed the same idea as the English waterman. மீகான் and மீகாமன், synonyms of these words, are in reality one and the same with them; only the initial *n* in the former pair is represented by *m* in the latter. The interchange between terminal m and n is not infrequent in Tamil words; E. G. கலம்=கலன், புலன்=புலம், பலம்=பலன். In this connection we may state that மாலுமி=pilot is a word foreign to our vocabulary and for which we, as well as the Malays, are indebted to the Arabs. This word brings to our memory another term which the Malays and Tamils share in common, but which, as William Marsden says, is a Malayalam (properly Tamilian) word transplanted into the Malayan language. We mean கப்பல் (kappal) which is probably a formation from கப்பு-log and ஆல்=by or with, and which implies that the first (*kappal*) was only a *catamaran*, or raft of logs.

நீகம்—the chief formative element of நீகான் and நீகாமன் is used in the following senses (1) a cloud (which is a mass of *watery* vapour, (2) a frog (which is remarkable for its rapid *swimming* or which generally lives in *water*). There is little doubt that this name is made up of root நீ=to swim and suffix அம். The presence of க may be accounted for as a phonetic insertion. In current language the unlettered people pronounce நாய்கள் and பூனைகள் as if these words were நாயள் and பூனையள். We are inclined to think that this termination அள் is the original of கள் and that it means a *handful*, and hence a crowd or number. This is the germ out of which அள்ளுகிறது to take up with the *hollow of the hand*, and அளக்கிறது originally to measure by the *hollow of the hand* or சிறங்கை have sprung. In like manner may the க in முகம் and * உலகம் be explained if there be sufficient evidence to prove their Tamil birth. The insertion of a consonant between two vowels that come in contact in the formation of derivative or compound words is solely for the sake of euphony, that is, for preventing the hiatus that would otherwise occur. In Tamil it is the letters ய (y) and வ (v) that are mostly employed to effect such a combination, but க(k) may as well be used to prevent the hiatus. The employment in Tamil of either (ய) y or (க) k to represent the H sound in some † Sanskrit words further convinces us that the insertion of க (k) in நீகம் is as reasonable as that of ய (y) would be. Even the *intrusion* of a consonaut is not unknown in some languages: for instance n in the following English words is nothing but intrusive :—

Messenger, Passenger, Poringer, and Nightingale (2nd n only).

In நீர்மை which we believe is admitted on all hands to be of Tamil extraction, there is ground for asserting with axiomatic truth that நீர் its radical element is of the same origin. Dr. Rottler, who in his dictionary assigns to நீர் or நீர்மை-disposition, a place quite separate from that of நீர்-water, shows thereby that two different words have assumed the same form. This undoubtedly arose from his inability to trace the one meaning from the other. It is not strange that the *beneficial* or *bounteous* nature of water or rain, which the divine Valluvar compares to ambrosia, was clearly visible to the mental eye of that Tamil philosopher who first used நீர்மை in the sense of *beneficence*. The notion of beneficence passed into that of good disposition, and so we come by its sense of disposition in general. He who denies the Tamil parentage of நீர்-water, should also deny that of நீர்-good disposition.

* The initial S of a root when followed by another consonant is generally dropped. Cf: Sans, *sru* with Lat. *Ru* and Gr: *Rheu*—to flow; Lat: Spec or spac with Sans. Pas-to see. Besides, such a clipping should be naturally expected in a language like the Tamil where there are no compound or concurrent consonants. The root *sna* would therefore be represented by *nâ* in Tamil, a modification of which is *nî* in நீந்து-நீர் and நீகம். cf. Sans. *mra* with *mri*—to grind.

* வையம் வையகம் or வைப்பு from the Tamil root வை-to place can, as a rule, be used in lieu of உலகம். We cannot therefore say that there would be no pure Tamil word to express the idea of world if we should exclude உலகம்.

†. Parihâsa—raillery becomes in Tamil பரியாசம் or பரிகாசு.

If this account about the meanings in question be deemed in any way unsatisfactory, the light thrown by the derivation of the English 'abundance' will make the connection perhaps more visible, though by a different link. Abundare in Latin means to overflow or to abound and is made up of ab-away and unda-wave or water [und, the root of unda, is a modified form of ud in Lat. udus-wet, and it is met with in Sans. und-to be wet. uda-water (from which are the Tamil உதம் உததி, உதகம்-water and உந்தி-river) A. S. yd. wave, Eng. wet and water. Icel. vatr==wet, Lith wandu=water, Sinhalese vadra=water and Gr. hudor=water]. In the subjoined distich of Tiruvalluvar, நீர்மை properly means plenty or fulness and not property (இயல்பு) as generally explained.

> நெடுங்கடலுந் தன்னீர்மை குன்றுந் தடிந்தெழிலி
> தானல்கா தாகி விடின்

Clearer still is the meaning fulness in நீரவர் which occurs in the following utterance of the same poet and ethical teacher, and which like சான்றோர் primarily means "full men" and then the wise.

> நிறைநீர நீரவர் கேண்மை பிறைமதிப்
> பின்னீர பேதையார் நட்பு

Now let us turn our attention to Pandit Savarirayan's article and see what is there that we cannot readily accept. It is specially the relationship which, without any proof whatever, he tries to establish between Tamilian and Aryan words. The word பால் respecting which the Pandit says that its ல் represents R in Lat. Pars, can be asserted with as full confidence to be a corruption of பகல், verbal noun of பகு-to be separate or to split, as we do say that பாசி, பாத்தி, மீதி, வீதம், ஆம், ஆனால், ஆல் and ஆன்ற are weakened forms respectively of பகுதி, பகுத்தி, மிகுதி, விகுதம், ஆகும், ஆகினால், அகல்வு and அகன்ற. What takes place under our own eyes should have also taken place in bygone times. ஆலம் or ஆல்-the name of the Banyan tree, is probably due to the fact that its branches spread *wide.* We ought however not to be surprised if somebody were to shew that this word is a variation of the Sanskrit சாலம் a tree in general, for the Banyan tree is recorded to have sometimes a diameter of even 375 feet spread (Vide Gamble's Manual of Indian Timbers), and therefore has a claim to be called "*the tree.*" Seeing that this species of the fig genus grows wild in the Sub-Himalayan tract whence the name Ficus Bengalensis, the above derivation from a Sanskrit word would be most reasonable but for the fact that in Sanskrit it is otherwise known. One of its Sanskrit names, viz., நியக்குரோதம் means also *breadth* and this we count as a point in favour of our etymology.

Not only the above mentioned words but even the case-ending ஆல் are the results of the action of the law, of syncopation. ஆல் stands for ஆகல், verbal noun of ஆகு to become, to be. Let us take a sentence and substitute therein ஆகல் for ஆல் in order to see whether our explanation stands to reason or not.

> காய்ச்சலாலிறந்தான் = காய்ச்சல் ஆகல் இறந்தான்
> He died of fever = Fever being, he died.

Such a construction is quite natural in the infancy of a language and answers the same purpose as the ablative absolute in Latin or the Nominative absolute in English. What is called the expletive use of ஆல் is best explained by the form ஆகல். In the following couplet there are two ஆல் which are shown as examples of this use.

> யாதானு நாடாமா லூராமா லென்னொருவன்
> சாந்துணையுங் கல்லாத வாறு.

Here யாதானு நாடாமல் = யாதானும் நாடாகும் ஆகல்
= Any place will become (the learned man's) country, being
= It being that any place, &c.
= If it is that any place, &c.

Similarly may the ஆல் in ஓரால், mayest thou ponder, be accounted for. We have thus seen that the letter க has been cut off from a good number of words including பால் of which the final letter has been clearly shewn to be a residue of the verbal suffix ஆல். The root of this word is therefore to be sought for in பகு–the analysis of which discloses *Pak*-a sound imitative of the crack of a nut buried in hot ashes. Whether this root has any connection with the Sanskrit Bhâga பாகம், we are at present unable to say, but it has put forth the following shoots.

பகை-Separation-hence enmity
பகல்-Division, midday, Day or Light
பகவு-Splitting, a piece, &c.
பகிர்-To divide

பங்கம்-Split, division, diversity

பங்கு-a portion

பக்கு-Breakage, split, bark, tartar, crust, &c.

பகர்-To *retail*, to cry out at a public sale, or to call out things along the streets, to say. cf. கூறு.

வகு-To divide.

வகிர்-To divide, to slice, to cut in longitudinal little pieces, to part the hair, a thong of leather

வார்=A thong, to part the hair, to trim a palm leaf, to take *away*, to gather.

On the other hand the Lat. Pars is followed up to the radical Par which means to produce, to provide and to share (Vide etymology of Part in Prof. Skeat's English Dictionary). In connection with the derivation of Lat. Mars-God of war, Prof. Max Muller makes the following note about the suffix in Pars. "Mars Martis is formed like Pars Partes which happens to correspond with Sans. Parus or Parvan."

Whatever be the primary meaning of Par, whether to separate (பிறி) or to produce, there is no doubt that R forms a part and parcel of the root, and is quite unlike the ல் in பால். Instead of adducing examples like the one in question for the * confusion between ல and ற the Pandit could have largely drawn from the vocabulary of the Tamil language where there are many words, especially naturalised Sanskrit words which have, certainly owing to imperfect articulation, undergone this interchange of letters. E. G.

(1) அலத்தம் / அரத்தம்	Sans. Alakta—Red cotton.
(2) அரி / அலி	Fire—God of death—from root *ar* to cut, to destroy.
(3) ஆரதி / ஆலத்தி / ஆலாத்தி	Sans. A'rati—the ceremony performed in marriages.
(4) இரகன் / இலகன்	Sans. Raghu—the name of an ancestor of Rama.
(5) இருப்பை / இலுப்பை	The Iluppai tree or Bassia *longifolia*. It is so called by reason of its long (இரு) leaves or of the durability (இருப்பு) of its wood. The coining of இருப்பை from இரு would exactly correspond to that of † கருப்பை from கரு—black.
(6) சீரை / சீலை	Sans. Chîra Cloth. The older of meaning of chira is probably the bark of a tree used as clothing.
(7) தரம் / தலை	Head-probably from the root of தரி-to wear or to bear.
(8) தாலம் / தாரம்	Sans. Tâla—tongue.
(9) அலத்தை / அரத்தை	From அலை-to move as a wave, hence vexation.
(10) கோடரி / கோடாலி	Hatchet (கோடு-branch + அரி-cut)

Even in European languages, such changes are not of uncommon occurrence. We refer the reader to the etymologies of English. Pilgrim Lavender, Lat. coeruleus=gloomy, lilium=lily. French rossignole=nightingale, and coronel=colonel. Lastly we should like to draw the attention of Pandit Savarirayan to the derivation of the Lat. addo the original of the English add. In the eyes of classical men its root is not *add* but da, addo being formed of the prep. ad=to and do=to give, to put; and it is owing to such a composition that this Latin verb sometimes takes a dative case after it, as adimunt diviti *addunt* pauperi. The similarity of sound now exists only between the Latin prep. ad and the Tamil radix ad. If our Pandit is taken up by this, it is for him to prove that this preposition is the remains of a Lat. root *ad*-to join. If our enquiries in this branch of knowledge be guided by sound without regard to the history of words, the result would be something similar to the account given of peacock by Dr. Johnson who thought that this fowl was so called by virtue of its *peak* or tuft. Researches since made have shewn beyond doubt that the English *Pea* (cock) the Lat. Pavo, the Gr. Taos or the Hebrew Tukim is a descendant of the Tamil Tôkai-peafowl (primarily *feathers* from tu-to hang) which King Solomon ordered from India. Not only for the peafowl but also for ginger and rice which in the classical languages are known as Gingibera (இஞ்சிவேர்) and oryya (அரிசி) are the Western nations greatly indebted to the Tamils especially of the Malabar coast where the Hebrews, the Phonecians, and the Greeks are said to have carried on trade in ancient times.

S. W. COOMARASWAMY.

---

* Some persons are unable to pronounce R and say dound, adithmetic instead of round and arithmetic; some change long into dong. The inability of these people to distinguish between these consonants does not warrant the conclusion that these sounds proceed from the same organ of speech. If it does, we may draw a similar conclusion with regard to K, T and P among which occasional changes take place.

† கருப்பை here means a *black rat* or a palmyra tree bearing *black fruits.*

THE KALITTOKAI.—I.

Mr. T. Virabhadra Mudaliyar, B.A., B.L. is doing an excellent service to literature in bringing this work to prominence. Though its place, in order of time, still remains unsettled, yet its antiquity is unquestionable. There also remains to be settled the question whether Nallantuvanar is its author in part, or only a compiler and editor. I should like to see scholars paying a little more attention to this work than they seem to have hitherto done. It contains a rich store of the choicest sentiments expressed in the choicest words in the language, *i.e.*, the simplest and homeliest words. Its ethical aspects may justly be thought unsuited to the young. But may it not with advantage be prescribed for the higher examinations of the University?

It seems the Mudaliar has used the edition of Rao Bahadur Tamotharam Pillai. That edition is the only printed one we have. Being such, it must be liable to errors. The Rao himself confesses that he is responsible for two kinds of them.

1st. He has substituted some words of his own in place of what some fastidious people considered an objectionable word in the text. But page 24 of his preface, in a manner, cures that mischief.

2nd. He has disregarded the division of stanzas into paragraphs made by the commentator for the convenience of commenting. This disregard is an injury to the intelligent reader who attempts to study the text and the commentary together. The mischief of the plan, which the Rao has adopted instead of that of the commentator, seems to have impressed itself on him at times. For he occasionally abandoned his own system too and has thereby rendered the study needlessly troublesome.

It is necessary that literary men should not be content, so long as there exists the slightest cause of doubt as to the accuracy of the copies we now have in common use.

In the stanza copied by the Mudaliar, I find the following errors, due to misprint in the Rao's edition:—

(*a*) தகையாதான் should be......தாம்.

(*b*) மணன்மேல் ; ஒன்றிநிறைவதை. There ought to be no mark after மேல்.

(c) கோதை பரிவு should be......பரிபு.

(*d*) காலொற்ற should be......சாலொத்த. This error is so frequent among editors that it may be looked upon as sanctioned by usage.

(*e*) வண்டல்வரக்கண்டேன் should be வண்டலவர் or வண்டலவர்க்......

(*f*) The தனிச்சொல். which occurs several times in the stanza, should form a line by itself as often as it occurs, or should at least be printed at the end of the line which precedes it, instead of the head of the line in which it stands.

(*g*) அயர்பு should be அயர்ப or அயர்வர். I must however observe that it is அயர்பு in சற்பியல் of தொல் (the Rao's edition) where it is quoted twice in the commentary, viz , under st. 5 and st. 50, and where, however, other discrepancies may be noticed. If the true reading is அயர்பு, then the commentary needs alterations.

(*h*) Some of the commas after ஒருத்தி are not wanted for the sense or the metre.

In the commentary of the stanza, I detect the following errors.

(*j*) வந்தன்றென்பதுபோல should probably be தந்...
in allusion to the கோவையார் st. 8 and st. 26. In the latter of these two stanzas there is, be it observed by the way, an error of the editor of the Kovaiyâr. He gives as நயந்தந்ததென்பது. Evidently it should be......தந்தன்றென்பது.

The same editor has misprinted a part of this stanza of the Kalittohai, quoted by Parimelalahar under குறள் (ch. 19. v. 7). He has கடியு மிடந்தேற்றான் சோர்ந்தனன்கை. It should be......தேற்றாள் சோர்ந்தனள்கை as the Rao and the Mudaliar have it.

(*k*) I suspect the word தண்டுகள் should be வங்குகள் or somthing like it.

(*l*) பரிவு shold be பரிபு as observed before.

(*m*) வினைவினை: முதலொடு முடிந்தது. The mark after வினை is an error. There should be no mark.

(*n*) தீர்ந்தன shoud be தீர்த்சன.

(*o*) செல்வந்தம்மின் should be செல்வர்த்......,the allusion being to துறைக்காஞ்சி l. 731.

In reading the commentaries of Nacchinârkkiniyar on this and other works, I have always felt a suspicion that the texts which he was commenting on

were in some instances corrupt even in his day; but he taxed his ingenuity to make sense of them as he found them, rather than correct them,—a very noble trait in an editor. The line ஓராங்காக்க has a false தளை. I don't believe the author had it so, while he preserved the தளை in all the remaining 67 lines. Perhaps ஓ and கா should be prolonged.

THE KALITTOKAI.—II.

1. This work consists of 150 கலிப்பாட்டு of various length and metres.

2. For convenience' sake we shall call a கலிப்பாட்டு a canto. Usually, under the name of கலிப்பாட்டு there are several stanzas following one another with or without a connecting word which is called தனிச்சொல். As its name indicates, the தனிச்சொல் is a word or a phrase forming a line by itself. It is sometimes written at the end of the line which precedes it, and is then reckoned as a supernumerary சீர் of that line.

A கலிப்பாட்டு may consist of an ahaval, a venpa or a kalippa, or a number of each of them or a mixture of some of them.

3. An ahaval consists of three or more lines. Each line consists of two, three, four or five சீர்; each சீர் is an இயற்சீர் or வெண்சீர். An இயற்சீர், as the reader knows, is a தேமா, புளிமா, கருவிளம், or கூவிளம்: and a வெண்சீர் is a தேமாங்காய், புளிமாங்காய், கருவிளங்காய் or கூவிளங்காய். For convenience' sake we may include மா, விளம் and காய் under the common name of கலிச்சீர்.

An அகவல் ends with the letter ஏ. In யாப்பருங்கலக்காரிகை we find it stated thus:—அகவலிசையன அகவன்மற்றவை ஏ, ஓ, ஈ, ஆ எனவென்றிறுமே என்றார் தொல் காப்பியனார். The Silappatikâram prefers the ending என.

When the penultimate line of an ahaval consists of four சீர், the ahaval is called நிலைமண்டிலம்; when it has only three it is called நேரிசை. The நேரிசை is most common in all works composed in ahaval metre. I believe there are only two நிலைமண்டிலம் in the whole of the Kalittokai. One occurs in the 129th canto, and the other will be found mentioned below.

4. A venpa consists of two or more lines. Each line (except the last) consists of four கலிச்சீர். The venpa uses what is called தளை, that is, connection between சீர் and சீர். The தளை used in venpa is called வெண்டளை. This தளை requires that when a சீர் ends in மா, the following சீர் should begin with a நிரை; and, that when a சீர் ends in விளம் or காய், the following சீர் should begin with a நேர். This connection or link is observed also between the end of one line and the beginning of another. The last line of a venpa consists of two complete சீர் and the first அசை of a third சீர். To this அசை there may be added a உ, கு, டு, து, பு or று. Some authors admit வு also.

5. The கலிப்பா consists of two or more lines, each consisting of four கலிச்சீர். It may sometimes end as a venpa ends.

6. எதுகை and மோனை, not being of the essence of poetry, may occasionally be neglected.

7. A கலிப்பாட்டு is sometimes divided into தரவு, தாழிசை, தனிச்சொல் and சுரிதகம். Between தரவு, தாழிசை and சுரிதகம் there is no essential difference. The தரவு is the stanza which begins the canto. The சுரிதகம் is the stanza that ends it. The தாழிசை intervenes between them. The தரவு usually consists of one stanza and the தாழிசை of three stanzas. If the தாழிசை happen to be each a கலிப்பா of four lines, the second lines of the three கலிப்பா usually end in the same word. So do the fourth lines. This sameness of termination occasionally take place in other lines as well. But it may be neglected altogether. In canto 130, each of the three தாழிசை is a stanza of two lines. And the first line of each of them ends in அரோவென.

The தனிச்சொல் usually precedes the சுரிதகம், but it may occur anywhere and any number of times. The 40th and 85th cantos for instance, open with the தனிச்சொல். When it does not immediately precede the சுரிதகம், it is called சொற்சீர் or சொற்சீரடி.

8. The first canto of the Kalittokai contains as follows:—

(1) The தரவு, which is a கலிப்பா of four lines.

(2) The தாழிசை, which are three கலிப்பா stanzas of three lines each. And each தாழிசை ends in the word தருவாளோ.

(3) The தனிச்சொல்.

(4) The சுரிதகம், which is a நேரிசை அகவல் of three lines.

9. The second canto is as follows:—

(1) The தரவு, which is a கலிப்பா of eight lines.

(2) The தாழிசை, consisting of three கலிப்பா stanzas of four lines each. The second lines of the three தாழிசை end in ஆகும் and the fourth lines in பிரியாமை பொருளா ...னல்லதை.

(3) The தனிச்சொல்.

(4) The சுரிதகம், which is a நேரிசை ஆசிரியப்பா ...கவல் of six lines.

The seventh line of the தரவு of this canto ...றுபெற் றுதிர்வனபோல் வரைபிளந் தியங்குநர். I have divided this line as I find it divided by the editor, notwithstanding the commentator's direction that the ... சீர் should be taken as ஏறு பெற்றுதிர், which though a ... சீர் and therefore inadmissible, is yet allowable in ... opinion by reason of its being a நேர்பு நேர் நிரை. ... prefer to follow the editor. For, of மா, விளங்காய் and கனி which are equally objected to by grammarians in this class of composition, the கனி is the only சீர் in respect of which all authors are agreed in upholding the objection.

10. In canto the fourth, the தரவு is a கலிப்பா using வெண்டளை. Such a கலிப்பா differs from a வெண்பா, only by having four சீர் in its last line, while the வெண்பா has only two and a half.

11. In canto 5, each of the three தாழிசை consists of two lines of கலிப்பா and ends in வாளோ.

12. Canto 6 is a perfect வெண்பா of eleven lines; such a வெண்பா is called கட்டளைக்கலி வெண்பாட்டு. It is வெண்பாட்டு, because it is a venpa standing for an entire கலிப்பாட்டு. It is called கட்டளைக்கலி to distinguish it from கலிவிருத்தம். And for the same reason கோவைக்கலித்துறை is also called கட்டளைக்கலித்துறை, namely, to distinguish it from கலிவிருத்தம் whose scansion is விளங்காய், விளங்காய், விளங்காய், மா and from விருத்தக்கலித்துறை whose scansion is மா, விளம், விளம், விளம், மா. For examples see Saravanapperumal's நைடதம்.

13. In the 7th canto there are

(1) The தரவு, which is a venpa of four lines.

(2) A தனிச்சொல் "நீயே" and a தாழிசை of two lines ending in நீயே.

(3) A தனிச்சொல் "இவட்கே" and a தாழிசை of two lines ending in ஏ. These two தனிச்சொல் and தாழிசை form a pair.

(4) Like this pair, there are two other pairs.

(5) Then follows another தனிச்சொல், and then the சுரிதகம்.

14. The twelfth canto would be a perfect வெண்பா of 19 lines, but for (a) சாரச்சாரல், which should properly be சார்ச்சாரல் like பைப்பய, அண்ணணித்து, &c. (b) நிரம்பா நீடத்தம், which should be நிரம்பாநீ டத்தம், (c) முற்றிய which should probably be முற்ற or முற்றும் or it may be that in ancient days it was allowable to cut off such a vowel as the இ in this place, which is really short though it is not classed among குற்றிய இகரம்.

(d) உருமை, which should probably be உருஅமை.

(e) இல்லை, which should probably be இல்லை இ.

(f) இடைமுலை is probably முலையிடை, though it does not affect the scansion.

A வெண்பா with broken தளை is a poetical impossibility. Of course the commentator speaks of there being such வெண்பா. But the text he was using was evidently corrupt even in his time:—a proof at once of its high antiquity and its commentator's honesty. In ... six ... quoted by Virabhadra Mudaliyar, consisting of ... eight lines which form no fewer than a dozen separate ... of தனிப்பா and அம்போதரங்கம் connected by a number ... in the ...ல், there occur only two cases of broken தளை ... used by the commentator and handed down to us ... It is more probable that these cases are due to error on the part of copyists than to wilfulness or oversight on the part of the author of the canto.

15. In the ... the தரவு which in ... canto the சுரிதகம் is longer than the same length, which is rare. In the 17th, both are of ... is also of rare occurrence.

16. The 18th canto ... a perfect வெண்பா of twelve lines.

17. The 19th canto co... altogether of two வெண்பா of six lines each.

18. The 21st canto is form... two separate அகவல். The first a நிலைமண்டிலம் with its last two line... and the second, ... தனிச்சொல் between ... நேரிசை அகவல்.

19. In the 22nd canto the சுரித... a வெண்பா of four lines.

20. The 65th canto is a வெண்பா of ... commentator observes that the வெண்தளை ... lines. The broken in it. But the broken தளை in the ... occasionally improved by writing ...தையாஅல் instead of line is the word is in the vocative case. After the ...ல் as read as follows:— ... line

ஏனைப் பிசாசரு ளென்னை நலிதரினி
இவ்வூர்ப் பலிபெருமற் கொள்வே னெனைப்பலவும்
தாக்காது வாய்ப்பாடி நிற்ப முதுபார்ப்பா
னஞ்சின னுத லறிந்திபா னெஞ்சா
தொருகைம் மணல்கொண்டு மேற்றூவக் கண்டே
கடிதரற்றிப் பூச ரொடுக்கின னுங்கே.

The twenty sixth line has only three சீர். Perhaps this is allowable in வெண்பா. For, it is தளை and not the number of சீர் or line that makes a வெண்பா. Confer canto 94 in which there occur two வெண்பா lines which have only two சீர் each. Nacchinârkkiniyar says that they are so in the original. But I suspect, *pace tanti nominis*, some error in them.

21. In the 33rd canto, the தரவு is a கலிப்பா of nine lines.

The first தாழிசை is a stanza of six lines, of which the first three lines are in the கலிப்பா metre and the next three are a வெண்டா.

The second தாழிசை would look better if the தனிச் சொல் were printed in separate lines.

22. In the 56th canto, the தரவு consists of a perfect venpa of 12 lines followed by a தனிச்சொல் and by a line of the same sort as the last line of a venpa. From this, it is clear that a venpa may consist of only one line. The commentator calls such venpa an அம்போத ரங்கம்.

In describing the தரவு of this canto as a perfect வெண்பா, I take கண்கூடு to be a misprint for தலைக்கூடு which will both restore the தளை and properly express the meaning given to the passage by the commentator.

In suggesting the several corrections which I suggest in this article, I by no means intend that the text should be corrected accordingly. If there be no manuscript authority for them, we must retain the text as we find it. And my suggestions will remain as mere conjectures.

C. BRITO.

KEEPING serene and passionless, there is no doubt that, as the days pass by, one is coming more and more within that influence which is the essence of life, and some day the disciple will be surprised to find he has grown wonderfully without knowing and perceiving the process of growth. For truly the Soul, in its true blooming, "grows like the flower, unconsciously," but gaining in sweetness and beauty by imbibing the sunshine of Spirit.

***

SPIRITUAL life and love are not exhausted by being spent. Expenditure only adds to the store and makes it richer and intenser. Try and be as happy and contented as you can, because in joy is the real spiritual life, and sorrow is but the result of our ignorance and absence of clear vision. So you should resist, as much as you can, the feeling of sadness; it clouds the spiritual atmosphere. And though you cannot entirely stop its coming, yet you should not altogether yield to it. For remember that at the very heart of the universe is Beatitude.

***

THE startling picture of Kâlî standing on the prostrate SHIVA is an illustration of the utility—the higher use—of Anger and Hatred. The black complexion represents Anger; with the sword it also means physical prowess; and the whole figure means that so long as a man has anger and hatred and physical strength he should use them for the suppression of the other passions, the massacre of the desires of the flesh. It also represents what really happens when first the mind turns towards the higher life. As yet we are wanting in wisdom and in mental equilibrium, and so we crush our desires with our passions; our anger we direct against our own vices, and thus suppress them; our pride also we employ against the unworthy tendencies of the body and mind alike, and thus gain the first rung of the ladder. The prostrate SHIVA shows that when one is engaged in a warfare like this, he pays no heed to his highest principle, the Atmâ—nay, he actually tramples upon it, and not until he has slain the last enemy of his Self does he come to recognise his actual position during the fight with regard to the Atmâ. Thus, Kâlî finds SHIVA at her feet only when she has killed the last Daitya, the personification of Ahamkâra, and then she blushes at her insane fury. So long as the passions have not all been subdued, we must use them for their own suppression, neutralising the force of one with that of another, and thus alone can we at first succeed in killing out selfishness, and in catching the first glimpse of our true Atmâ—the SHIVA within us—which we ignore while desires rage in the heart.

From the Doctrine of the Heart.